arXiv:1408.4468v1 [cs.DB] 19 Aug 2014

# Undecidability of Finite Model Reasoning in $\mathcal{DLFD}$

David Toman and Grant Weddell

Cheriton School of Computer Science
University of Waterloo, Canada
{david,gweddell}@uwaterloo.ca

**Abstract.** We resolve an open problem concerning finite logical implication for path functional dependencies (PFDs). This note is an addendum to [4].

In this note we show that the finite logical implication for description logics endowed with PFDs is undecidable. This result complements the decidability of the unrestricted problem that is complete for EXPTIME [2,3].

## 1 Preliminaries

**Definition 1 (Description Logic $\mathcal{DLFD}$)** *Let $F$ and $C$ be sets of feature names and primitive concept names, respectively. A* path expression *is defined by the grammar "$\mathsf{Pf} ::= f.\mathsf{Pf} \mid Id$" for $f \in F$. We define derived* concept descriptions *by a second grammar on the left-hand-side of Figure 1. A concept description obtained by using the final production of this grammar is called a* path-functional dependency *(PFD).*

*An* inclusion dependency $\mathcal{C}$ *is an expression of the form $D \sqsubseteq E$. A* terminology $\mathcal{T}$ *consists of a finite set of inclusion dependencies.*

*The* semantics *of expressions is defined with respect to a structure $(\Delta, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$, where $\Delta$ is a domain of "objects" and $(.)^{\mathcal{I}}$ an interpretation function that fixes the interpretations of primitive concepts $C$ to be subsets of $\Delta$ and primitive features $f$ to be total functions $(f)^{\mathcal{I}} : \Delta \to \Delta$. The interpretation is extended to path expressions, $(Id)^{\mathcal{I}} = \lambda x.x$, $(f.\mathsf{Pf})^{\mathcal{I}} = (\mathsf{Pf})^{\mathcal{I}} \circ (f)^{\mathcal{I}}$ and derived concept descriptions $D$ and $E$ as defined on the right-hand-side of Figure 1.*

*An interpretation* satisfies an inclusion dependency $D \sqsubseteq E$ *if $(D)^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq (E)^{\mathcal{I}}$. The* logical implication problem *asks if $\mathcal{T} \models D \sqsubseteq E$ holds; that is, if $(D)^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq (E)^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all interpretations that satisfy all constraints in $\mathcal{T}$.*

In addition, we classify constraints by the description on their right-hand side as *PFDs*, when the right-hand side is of the form $D : \mathsf{Pf}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{Pf}_k \to \mathsf{Pf}$, and as *simple constraints* otherwise.

| | Syntax | Semantics: "$(\cdot)^{\mathcal{I}}$" |
|---|---|---|
| $D$ | $::= C$ | $(C)^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta$ |
| | $\mid D_1 \sqcap D_2$ | $(D_1)^{\mathcal{I}} \cap (D_2)^{\mathcal{I}}$ |
| | $\mid \neg D$ | $\Delta \setminus (D)^{\mathcal{I}}$ |
| | $\mid \forall f.D$ | $\{x : (f)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \in (D)^{\mathcal{I}}\}$ |
| $E$ | $::= D$ | |
| | $\mid E_1 \sqcap E_2$ | $(E_1)^{\mathcal{I}} \cap (E_2)^{\mathcal{I}}$ |
| | $\mid D : \mathsf{Pf}_1, ..., \mathsf{Pf}_k \to \mathsf{Pf}$ | $\{x : \forall\, y \in (D)^{\mathcal{I}}. \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} (\mathsf{Pf}_i)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) = (\mathsf{Pf}_i)^{\mathcal{I}}(y) \to (\mathsf{Pf})^{\mathcal{I}}(x) = (\mathsf{Pf})^{\mathcal{I}}(y)\}$ |

**Fig. 1.** Syntax and Semantics of $\mathcal{DLFD}$.

## 2 Undecidability

We show a reduction of a tiling problem to the finite logical implication problem for $\mathcal{DLFD}$ using a construction similar to that presented in [4]. In this earlier work, the *unrestricted* tiling problem that asks if an infinite tiling exists was used. In our case, we rely on a finite version of a similar problem that remains undecidable.

A tiling problem $U$ is a triple $(T, H, V)$ in which $T$ is a finite set of tile types and $H, V \subseteq T \times T$ are a pair of binary relations. A solution to a tiling problem is an assignment of tiles to a two-dimensional surface that satisfies the $H$ and $V$ relations.[1] For example, a solution for an *unrestricted upper quadrant tiling problem* is a function $t : \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \to T$ such that $(t(i,j), t(i+1,j)) \in H$ and $(t(i,j), t(i,j+1)) \in V$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$. This problem can simulate a *Turing machine looping* problem, which is not decidable [1,5]. Similarly, determining if a finite $n \times m$ tiling exists, for some $n, m > 0$, (given an initial tile placed in a lower left corner) implies that a Turing machine halts (starting from an empty tape). To reduce notation in the following, we consider more particularly the tiling problem of a *finite torus*. (It is straightforward but tedious to show how to simulate an $n \times m$ tiling with a finite torus tiling.)

The main step in the reduction is to establish an integer torus in which an arbitrarily large finite rectangle can be embedded. This can be achieved, e.g., as follows.

1. Introduce four disjoint concepts, $A$, $B$, $C$ and $D$, to denote cell edges.

$$\mathrm{A} \sqcap \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \bot, \quad \mathrm{A} \sqcap \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \bot, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathrm{C} \sqcap \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \bot$$

2. Map grid cells to concepts X and Y that have four incoming $f$ and $g$ attributes, respectively.

$$\mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \forall a.\mathrm{A} \sqcap \forall b.\mathrm{B} \sqcap \forall c.\mathrm{C} \sqcap \forall d.\mathrm{D}, \qquad \mathrm{Y} \sqsubseteq \forall a'.\mathrm{A} \sqcap \forall b'.\mathrm{B} \sqcap \forall c'.\mathrm{C} \sqcap \forall d'.\mathrm{D}$$

[1] The types of tiles placed side-by-side or one above the other must appear in $H$ and in $V$, respectively.




**Fig. 2.** Interpretation Forming a Tiled Torus.

$$\mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{X} : a \to Id,\ \mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{X} : b \to Id,\ \mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{X} : c \to Id,\ \mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{X} : d \to Id$$
$$\mathrm{Y} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{Y} : a' \to Id,\ \mathrm{Y} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{Y} : b' \to Id,\ \mathrm{Y} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{Y} : c' \to Id,\ \mathrm{Y} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{Y} : d' \to Id$$

$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X} \sqcap \forall g.\mathrm{Y},\ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X} \sqcap \forall g.\mathrm{Y},\ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X} \sqcap \forall g.\mathrm{Y},\ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X} \sqcap \forall g.\mathrm{Y}$$

$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : f \to Id,\ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : f \to Id,\ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : f \to Id,\ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : f \to Id$$
$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : g \to Id,\ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : g \to Id,\ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : g \to Id,\ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : g \to Id$$

3. Ensure that squares are formed by adding the following[2].

$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : f \to h,\ \ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : f \to i,\ \ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : f \to h,\ \ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : f \to i,$$
$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : h \to f,\ \ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : i \to f,\ \ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : h \to f,\ \ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : i \to f,$$
$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : g \to i,\ \ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : g \to h,\ \ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : g \to i,\ \ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : g \to h,$$
$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{B} : i \to g,\ \ \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{C} : h \to g,\ \ \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} : i \to g,\ \ \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{A} : h \to g$$

The dependencies $\mathrm{X} \sqsubseteq \forall a.\mathrm{A} \sqcap \mathrm{X} : a \to Id$ and $\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X} \sqcap \mathrm{A} : a \to Id$ induce, as a finite logical consequence, an incoming $f$ feature originating in an A object for *every* X object. The same holds for B, C, and D objects; hence every X object has four incoming $f$ features.

4. And force squares to extend to the right and up by including the following.

$$\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \forall g.\mathrm{Y}, \quad \mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \forall g.\mathrm{Y}, \quad \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X}, \quad \mathrm{D} \sqsubseteq \forall f.\mathrm{X}$$

[2] Note that the asymmetric PFDs can be simulated by the following $\mathrm{A} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{AB}$, $\mathrm{B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{AB}$, and $\mathrm{AB} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{AB} : f \to h$ (and similarly for the remaining cases).

The accumulated effect of these inclusion dependencies on an interpretation is illustrated in Figure 2.

The adjacency rules for the instance $U$ of the tiling problem can now be captured as follows:

$$\mathrm{A} \sqcap \forall g.T_i \sqsubseteq \forall f. \bigsqcup_{(t_i,t_j)\in V} T_j, \qquad \mathrm{C} \sqcap \forall f.T_i \sqsubseteq \forall g. \bigsqcup_{(t_i,t_j)\in V} T_j$$
$$\mathrm{B} \sqcap \forall f.T_i \sqsubseteq \forall g. \bigsqcup_{(t_i,t_j)\in H} T_j, \qquad \mathrm{D} \sqcap \forall g.T_i \sqsubseteq \forall f. \bigsqcup_{(t_i,t_j)\in H} T_j,$$

where $T_i$ corresponds to a tile type $t_i \in T$; we assume $T_i \sqcap T_j \sqsubseteq \bot$ for all $i < j$.

The combination of all the above comprise a terminology $\mathcal{T}_U$ associated with a tiling problem $U$. Now, $U$ admits a finite solution iff

$$\mathcal{T}_U \not\models_{\mathrm{fin}} \mathrm{X} \sqcap T_0 \sqsubseteq \bot,$$

where $T_0$ is an initial tile. And since the halting problem can be reduced to the existence of a finite tiling, we therefore have the following.

**Theorem 2** *The finite logical implication problem for $\mathcal{DLFD}$ is undecidable.*

Consequently, finite satisfiability $\mathcal{DLFD}$ knowledge bases is also undecidable. Note that the construction uses only unary keys (functionality) and unary functional dependencies and does not need the full power of PFDs.

## References


1. R. Berger. The undecidability of the dominoe problem. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 66:1–72, 1966.
2. David Toman and Grant Weddell. On Reasoning about Structural Equality in XML: A Description Logic Approach. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 336(1):181–203, 2005.
3. David Toman and Grant E. Weddell. On Attributes, Roles, and Dependencies in Description Logics and the Ackermann Case of the Decision Problem. In *Description Logics 2001*, pages 76–85. CEUR-WS vol.49, 2001.
4. David Toman and Grant E. Weddell. On the interaction between inverse features and path-functional dependencies in description logics. In *Proc. Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 603–608, 2005.
5. P. van Emde Boas. The convenience of tilings. In *Complexity, Logic, and Recursion Theory*, volume 187 of *Lecture notes in pure and applied mathe-matics*, pages 331–363. Marcel Dekker Inc., 1997.